



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

X

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,548	04/19/2004	Dale B. Schenk	15270J-004747US	3885
20350	7590	02/04/2005		
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834				EXAMINER
				NICHOLS, CHRISTOPHER J
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1647

DATE MAILED: 02/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/828,548	SCHENK, DALE B.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher J Nichols, Ph.D.	1647	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 56-195 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 56-195 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Application, Amendments, and/or Claims

1. The Preliminary Amendment filed 27 August 2004 has been received and entered in full.
2. The Preliminary Amendment filed 9 August 2004 has been received and entered in full.
3. The Preliminary Amendment filed 28 June 2004 has been received and entered in full.
4. The Preliminary Amendment filed 19 April 2004 has been received and entered in full.

Election/Restrictions

5. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims **56-100, 120-122, and 139-184**, drawn to a method for treating a subject with amyloidosis comprising administering an antibody, classified in class 424, subclass 130.1, for example.
 - II. Claims **101-119 and 123-138**, drawn to antibodies and composition thereof, classified in class 530, subclass 387.1, for example.
 - III. Claims **185-192**, drawn to an immunoglobulin polypeptide or fragment thereof which binds to an amyloid fibril and is effective to enhance the cellular immune response of a patient to remove disease-associated amyloid fibril deposits and compositions comprising same, classified in class 530, subclass 387.1, for example.
 - IV. Claims **193-194**, drawn to a nucleic acid molecule and host cell comprising same, classified in class 435, subclass 325, for example.

V. Claim 195, drawn to a method of producing an immunoglobulin polypeptide, classified in class 435, subclass 69.1, for example.

6. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:
7. Although there are no provisions under the section for "Relationship of Inventions" in M.P.E.P. § 806.05 for inventive groups that are directed to different products, restriction is deemed to be proper because these products constitute patentably distinct inventions for the following reasons.
8. Inventions II, III, and IV are directed to products that are distinct both physically and functionally, are not required one for the other, and are therefore patentably distinct.
9. The antibody of Invention II is independent and distinct form the immunoglobulin of Invention III because it is not required to make or use the antibody of Invention II. Also the antibody of Invention II is independent and distinct form the immunoglobulin of Invention III because it can be used in materially different methods, such as in various diagnostic (e.g., as a probe in immunoassays or immunochromatography) or therapeutic methods. The antibody of Invention II is independent and distinct from the nucleic acid of Invention IV because it can be made through materially different methods such as immunization of an animal or chemical synthesis.
10. The immunoglobulin of Invention III is independent and distinct form the antibody of Invention II because it is not required to make or use the immunoglobulin of Invention III. Also the immunoglobulin of Invention III is independent and distinct form the antibody of Invention II because it can be used in other materially different methods, such as in various diagnostic (e.g., as a probe in immunoassays or immunochromatography) or therapeutic methods. The

immunoglobulin of Invention III is independent and distinct from the nucleic acid of Invention IV because it can be made through materially different methods such as immunization of an animal or chemical synthesis.

11. The isolated nucleic acid and host cells of Invention IV are independent and distinct from the antibodies of Inventions II and III because they can be used in processes other than to make the antibodies of Inventions II and III, such as gene therapy or as a probe in nucleic acid hybridization assays.

12. Although there are no provisions under the section for "Relationship of Inventions" in M.P.E.P. § 806.05 for inventive Inventions that are directed to different methods, restriction is deemed to be proper because these methods appear to constitute patentably distinct inventions for the following reasons: Inventions I and V are directed to methods that are distinct both physically and functionally, and are not required one for the other. Invention I requires search and consideration of passive immunization to treat amyloidosis, which is not required by Invention V. Invention V requires search and consideration of recombinant production of a polypeptide, which is not required by Invention I.

13. Inventions II and I are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the antibodies of Invention II can be used in materially different methods such as to purify amyloid protein or immunocytochemistry.

14. Inventions III and I are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the immunoglobulin of Invention III can be used in materially different methods such as to purify amyloid protein or immunocytochemistry.

15. Inventions IV and I are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions of Inventions IV and I are unrelated product and method, wherein each is not required, one for another. For example, the claimed method of Invention I does not recite the use or production of the nucleic acid of Invention IV.

16. Inventions V and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the antibodies of Invention II can be made through materially different methods such as immunization of an animal or chemical synthesis.

17. Inventions V and III are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the

immunoglobulin of Invention III can be made through materially different methods such as immunization of an animal or chemical synthesis.

18. Inventions IV and V are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the nucleic acid and host cell of Invention IV can be used in materially different methods such in gene therapy or as a probe in nucleic acid hybridization assays.

19. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

- a) Late or early onset Alzheimer's disease
- b) SAA amyloidosis
- c) Hereditary Icelandic syndrome
- d) Multiple myeloma
- e) Mad cow disease
- f) Creutzfeldt Jakob disease
- g) Sheep scrapie
- h) Mink spongiform encephalopathy
- i) Mild cognitive impairment
- j) Alzheimer's disease associated with Down's syndrome

Art Unit: 1647

20. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 85 is generic.

21. **If applicant selects Invention I, one species from the disease or disorder group must be chosen to be fully responsive.**

22. Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

23. Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

24. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

25. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

- a) Mild cognitive impairment

b) Cerebral amyloid angiopathy or congophilic angiopathy

c) Alzheimer's disease associated with Down's syndrome

d) Inclusion-body myositis

26. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 86 is generic.

27. If applicant selects Invention I, one species from the disease or disorder group must be chosen to be fully responsive.

28. Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

29. Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

30. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Art Unit: 1647

31. The Examiner has required restriction between product and method claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn method claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Method claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier.**

Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

32. In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined method claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined method claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and method claims may be maintained. Withdrawn method claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined.

See “Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b),” 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the method claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the method claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Art Unit: 1647

33. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the Examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

34. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

35. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, separate search requirements, and/or different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

36. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Christopher James Nichols, Ph.D.** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-0889**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Brenda Brumback** can be reached on **(571) 272-0961**.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **703-872-9306**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866-217-9197** (toll-free).

CJN
January 24, 2005

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Christopher James Nichols, Ph.D.", is positioned below the typed name and above the date.